"Suppose Germany Wins"

Reg. No. B 3092

HARIJAN

Editor: MAHADEV DESAI

VOL. IX, NO. 5] AHMEDABAD — SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1942 [FIVE PICE

Notice

The next issue, to be published on 22nd February, will contain *twelve pages* and will be priced at *two annas* per copy. Agents will please notify changes in their requirements, if any, by Thursday next. *Manager*

Notes

Seth Jamnalal Bajaj

In Seth Jamnalal Bajaj death has taken a mighty man. Whenever I wrote of wealthy men becoming trustees of their wealth for the common good I always had this merchant prince principally in mind. If his trusteeship did not reach the ideal, the fault was not his. I deliberately restrained him. I did not want him in his enthusiasm to take a single step which in his cool moments he might regret. His simplicity was all his own. Every house he built for himself became a *dharmashala*. His contribution as a satyagrahi was of the highest order. In political discussions he held his own. His judgments were sound. As an act of renunciation his last was the crown of all. He wanted to take up a constructive activity to which he could devote the rest of his life and in which he could use all his abilities. This was the preservation of the cattle wealth of India personified in the cow. He threw himself into the work with a single-mindedness and zeal I had never seen surpassed. His generosity knew no distinction of race, creed or colour. He wanted to perform a rare thing for a busy man. He wanted to control his thoughts so as to prevent a single intruder from coming in. The world s poorer for his death. The country has lost one of the bravest of its servants. Janakidevi, the widow, has decided to take up the work to which he had dedicated himself. She has divested herself of all her personal property valued at about two and a half lacs. May God enable her to fulfil the trust she has undertaken.

Sevagram, 11-2-42

Misbehaviour of Troops

I have piteous letters from correspondents complaining of misbehaviour by troops, White and Indian. There are detailed letters from Dohad and Rutlam stations and others too. The troops are said to have molested the hawkers on the platforms, helped themselves to eatables and hit the salesmen who protested. The station masters were powerless to afford protection. I do not know how much credit is to be attached to the descriptions I have received. The evidence is so detailed and given with so much moderation as to command belief. Anyway I draw the attention of the authorities to. the complaints. Any such misbehaviour should be put down summarily and repetition made practically impossible, if panic is to be prevented and bitterness avoided. I would advise the aggrieved parties to lodge their complaints to the proper authorities with authentic evidence in support.

Sevagram, 8-2-42

Hyderabad State

Swami Ramananda Tirtha of the banned State Congress has issued the following sober statement:

"Some of the workers of the Hyderabad State Congress, which was banned on 2nd March 1940, offered individual satyagraha in the month of September 1940 under the guidance of Mahatma Gandhi. The Government of H. E. H. the Nizam released them unconditionally on 16th December 1941. Immediately after the release, I issued a statement saying that, though the Government had released us, it did not remove the aforesaid ban. It seemed to us, therefore, that it was incumbent upon us to continue the satyagraha till our demand for lifting the ban was conceded by the Government. After our release we consulted Mahatmaji and explained to him the present situation in Hyderabad State and our own point of view. Taking into consideration the present critical phase of the war, he advised us to abstain from reoffering satyagraha at this hour, and directed us to concentrate our energies wholly on the constructive programme. We have, therefore, decided to faithfully follow Mahatmaji's advice. We more and more appreciate the vital importance of the constructive programme and its potentialities. We therefore appeal to the people in general and workers in particular to devote their energies to this programme. We may not even seem to embarrass H. E. H.'s Government at this critical juncture. This suspension, however, does not mean any alteration in our goal which is the attainment of responsible government under the aegis of H. E. H. the Nizam and the Asafjahi Dynasty."

How I wish the Government of H. E. H. the Nizam would remove the ban. They cannot wish to prevent people from carrying on a constitutional movement in favour of responsible government under the aegis of H. E. H. the Nizam. The recent release of the satyagrahis loses all grace if the ban on the State Congress is not removed.

Sevagram, 8-2-42 **M. K. G.**

QUESTION BOX

(By M. K. Gandhi)

Hindu-Muslim Puzzle

Q. In your proposed solution of the Hindu-Muslim puzzle, do you expect all the Hindus to abstain from the legislatures or only a part? If only a part, will not the most reactionary Hindus get in and make things worse than now? And if you expect Congressmen to affect the Muslim mind from outside, why can't you do the same and perhaps more effectively by being inside?

A. I do not expect all the Hindus to abstain. I know that all Hindu seats will be filled by non-Congress Hindus. Congress Hindus, if they go in, will be ground down between the two stones of the communal *chakki* without doing any good to anybody. I do not approach the question as a Hindu. I approach it as a Congressman seeking to represent equally all communities. But for the artificial system introduced in the composition of the Indian legislatures, all the members would be representing not communities but their parties grouped according to their non-communal shibboleths. As one representing all communities I would expect not only Hindus but Congress-minded Muslims and others too to avoid the legislatures and elective bodies. These abstainers will hold the scales evenly between all communities and seek to affect the legislatures from outside. Whether they are many or only a few, they will play the role of wise men. If all listened to me, the communal question would disappear from our midst. By entering the legislatures the Congress Hindus become interlopers, and act weakly for fear of offending one party or the other. This I know, that at the present moment the legislatures are, and must become, part of the war machinery. They have no choice. They will not be allowed to function, if they obstruct the war effort. How could the rulers whose sole occupation is to prosecute the war do otherwise?

Why Not in Hindu Majority Provinces?

Q. Why not advise Congressmen to withdraw from the provincial legislatures too where the Hindus are in a majority?

A. Because I do not want the non-Muslim minority parties to act as if they were the majority and carry on the government in these provinces. It would be a false position to which the Congress would be a willing party, if the Congress members withdrew. In these provinces, therefore, abstention cannot solve the communal tangle, and will bring about an unintended and undesirable state of things.

Torturing the Language?

Q. Surely you are torturing the language when you use the word 'unitary' in the place of 'unilateral'. For that is obviously what you mean.

A. I must plead not guilty. 'Unilateral' has a definite legal meaning which does not fit in with what I am struggling to convey. It is not one-sidedness. It is no-sidedness. It has impartiality implied in it. But it is not the method of impartiality. It is something more. I represent a party, say the Congress. For the solution of the problem I apply a method whereby I seek to affect those who are estranged from me. I am not merely impartial, because I may or may not please them. Impartiality has to be felt by the aggrieved party. My conduct is independent of the feeling of the aggrieved party. I go the utmost length to placate the offended party, and trust my out and out pure conduct to affect them. I may not succeed at once. But if there is a real sense of justice in the method, it must succeed. For want of a better word I have called the method 'unitary'. The dictionary meaning satisfies my test which I have imperfectly described here.

Sevagram, 3-2-42

ADIVASIS

(By M. K. Gandhi)

Adivasis have become the fourteenth item in the constructive programme. But they are not the least in point of importance. Our country is so vast and the races so varied that the best of us, in spite of every effort, cannot know all there is to know of men and their condition. As one comes upon layer after layer of things one ought to know as a national servant, one realises how difficult it is to make good our claim to be one nation whose every unit has a living consciousness of being one with every other.

The Adivasis are 2½ crores in all India, i. e. 6½ per cent of the total population or nearly half of the Harijan population.

Shri Balasaheb Kher has thrown himself with his usual zeal into this much needed service in the Thana District. He says in the pamphlet issued by him on behalf of the Adivasi Seva Mandal of which he is President:

"Many of these aborigines have been reduced to a state of actual slavery. 'Beth' or 'veth' or forced labour is exacted from them without payment of any wages or with only a nominal payment by zamindars, sowkars or forest contractors. As mentioned in Mr. Symington's Report on the Aboriginal and Hill Tribes published by Government in 1939, 'all jungle tract tenants (in the Province of Bombay) are liable to be called upon to work for their landlords. This forced labour is demanded for as many days as are necessary for the landlords' requirements. If they refuse or procrastinate, they are liable to assault or beatings.' Says Mr. Symington: 'I was told, on credible authority, of men being tied up to posts and whipped. There are also rumours of men in the past having been killed.' 'The maximum remuneration of forced labour is one anna per diem. More often rice is given, barely sufficient for one man for one meal.' The report then describes the appalling conditions of their slave life and observes: 'Landlords will not scruple to use their power in fulfilment of their purposes, for instance the use of their tenants' womenfolk for the gratification of their lust.' It will thus be seen that these tribes live a life of perpetual fear, misery and ill-health. They are so illiterate that they cannot count numbers beyond twenty, and are thus easily cheated by landlords, sowkars and contractors. They cannot avail themselves of medical aid, have poor health, and live in insanitary conditions."

Balasaheb has made a modest beginning. He has started with a hostel for Adivasi boys. His work is

all unassuming and solid. If he gets the true type of workers, what is a small beginning may one day blossom forth into an all-India organisation covering the whole of the Adivasi population. Truly "the harvest is rich and the labourers few." Who can deny that all such service is not merely humanitarian but solidly national and brings us nearer to true Independence?

Sevagram, 9-2-42

INDIVIDUAL OR COLLECTIVE?

(By M. K. Gandhi)

Shri Jamnalal Bajaj has bravely taken the burden of the great work of cow service (in other words, cattle preservation) on his shoulders. The most important question for consideration before the recent Go-Seva Sangh Conference was whether cow farming should be in the hands of individuals or done collectively. I myself had no hesitation in saying that she could never be saved by individual farming. Her salvation, and with her that of the buffalo, could only be brought about by collective endeavour. It is quite impossible for an individual farmer to look after the welfare of his cattle in his own home in a proper and scientific manner. Amongst other causes lack of collective effort has been a principal cause of the deterioration of the cow and hence of cattle in general.

The world today is moving towards the ideal of collective or co-operative effort in every department of life. Much in this line has been and is being accomplished. It has come into our country also, but in such a distorted form that our poor have not been able to reap its benefits. *Pari passu* with the increase in our population land holdings of the average farmer are daily decreasing. Moreover what the individual possesses is often fragmentary. For such farmers to keep cattle in their homes is a suicidal policy; and yet this is their condition today. Those who give the first place to economics and pay scant attention to religious, ethical or humanitarian considerations proclaim from the house-tops that the farmer is being devoured by his cattle due to the cost of their feed which is out of all proportion to what they yield. They say it is folly not to slaughter wholesale all useless animals.

What then should be done by humanitarians is the question. The answer obviously is to find a way whereby we may not only save the lives of our cattle but also see that they do not become a burden. I am sure that co-operative effort can help us in a large measure.

The following comparison may be helpful:

1. Under the collective system no farmer can keep cattle in his house as he does today. They foul the air, and dirty the surroundings. There is neither intelligence nor humanitarianism in living with animals. Man was not meant to do so. The space taken up by the cattle today would be spared to the farmer and his family, if the collective system were adopted.

2. As the number of cattle increases, life becomes impossible for the farmer in his home. Hence he is obliged to sell the calves and kill the male buffaloes or else turn them out to starve and die. This inhumanity would be averted, if the care of cattle were undertaken on a co-operative basis.

3. Collective cattle farming would ensure the supply of veterinary treatment to animals when they are ill. No ordinary farmer can afford this on his own.

4. Similarly one selected bull can be easily kept for the need of several cows under the collective system. This is impossible otherwise except for charity.

5. Common grazing ground or land for exercising the animals will be easily available under the co-operative system, whereas today generally there is nothing of the kind for individual farmers.

6. The expense on fodder will be comparatively far less under the collective system.

7. The sale of milk at good prices will be greatly facilitated, and there will be no need or temptation for the farmer to adulterate it as he does as an individual.

8. It is impossible to carry out tests of the fitness of every head of cattle individually, but this could easily be done for the cattle of a whole village and would thus make it easier to improve the breed.

9. The foregoing advantages should be sufficient argument in favour of co-operative cattle farming. The strongest argument in its favour is that the individualistic system has been the means of making our own condition as well as that of our cattle pitiable. We can only save ourselves and them by making this essential change.

I firmly believe too that we shall not derive the full benefits of agriculture until we take to co-operative farming. Does it not stand to reason that it is far better for a hundred families in a village to cultivate their lands collectively and divide the income therefrom than to divide the land anyhow into a hundred portions? And what applies to land applies equally to cattle.

It is quite another matter that it may be difficult to convert people to adopt this way of life straightaway. The straight and narrow road is always hard to traverse. Every step in the programme of cow service is strewn with thorny problems. But only by surmounting difficulties can we hope to make the path easier. My purpose for the time being is to show the great superiority of collective cattle farming over the individual effort. I hold further that the latter is wrong and the former only is right. In reality even the individual can only safeguard his independence through co-operation. In cattle farming the individual effort has led to selfishness and inhumanity, whereas the collective effort can abate both the evils, if it does not remove them altogether.

Sevagram, 8-2-42 (From *Harijansevak*)

Economics of Khadi

By Gandhiji

Pages 628. Price Rs. 4. Postage etc. As. 10

Can be had at Navajivan office, Post Box 105, Ahmedabad, and at 130 Princess St., Bombay.

HARIJAN
Feb. 15 1942

"SUPPOSE GERMANY WINS"

(By M. K. Gandhi)

"Suppose Germany wins with India not having entered the war, would Hitler leave India alone? Certainly not, my dear Mr. Gandhi, he will have a greater say in India than what Britain has now. The difference is this. You can fight the Englishman, but you cannot fight the German once he puts his foot on India's soil. Civil disobedience is the terror of the Englishman, it is the daily bread of the Nazi."

This is a question extracted from a very long and earnest letter from an English correspondent from South Africa. The first fallacy is that India is assumed not to have entered the war when to all intents and purposes she is in the war in spite of the powerful protest of the Congress. She is so much in the war that Great Britain is effectively using all the available fighting material which her generals have brought into being and trained, and is draining all the money she can. Politically-minded Indians have never been trained except for doing the rulers' clerical work. They are certainly holding themselves aloof until certain obviously necessary conditions are fulfilled. I do not see how they can be blamed for demanding the very liberty in defence of which the Allied Powers are said to be fighting. What Indians can do even if their demand is accepted is to give their moral weight to the struggle. This the rulers evidently do not care for. It cannot, in their opinion, turn the scales in their favour. Moral values do not count when each party swears by its material and physical resources. The Congress, with all the will in the world to defeat Nazism, cannot thrust its help on Great Britain which evidently does not want it or about which it is at least indifferent. If, therefore, Great Britain suffers defeat, it will not be for want of Congress co-operation but for causes over which the Congress can have no control.

If the Nazis come to India, the Congress will give them the same fight that it has given Great Britain. I do not underrate the power of satyagraha as the questioner does. But that is pure speculation. Imperialism has kept its grip on India for more than 150 years. If it is overthrown by a worse type of rule, the Congress can have the negative satisfaction of knowing that no other 'ism' can possibly last beyond a few years even if it establishes a foothold in India. That is as I read the Congress mind. Personally I think the end of this giant war will be what happened in the fabled Mahabharata War. The Mahabharata has been aptly described by a Travancorian as the Permanent History of Man. What is described in that great epic is happening today before our very eyes. The warring nations are destroying themselves with such fury and ferocity that the end will be mutual exhaustion. The victor will share the fate that awaited the surviving Pandavas. The mighty warrior Arjuna was looted in broad daylight by a petty robber. And out of this holocaust must arise a new order for which the exploited millions of toilers have so long thirsted. The prayers of peace-lovers cannot go in vain. Satyagraha is itself an unmistakable mute prayer of an agonised soul.

Sevagram, 10-2-42

GO-SEVA SANGH

II

Sink or Swim Together

The depth of Gandhiji's feeling on the whole subject may be measured from the concluding part of his address: "Unless you offer your full co-operation to Jamnalalji, especially on the question of *pinjrapols*, his best efforts cannot succeed. Today the cow is on the brink of extinction, and I am not sure that our efforts will ultimately succeed. But if she dies, we also die along with her — we, i. e. our civilisation, I mean our essentially non-violent and rural civilisation. We have, therefore, to make our choice. We can choose to be violent and kill all uneconomic cattle. Like Europe we should then breed our cattle for the purposes of milk and meat. But our civilisation is fundamentally different. Our life is wrapped up in our animals. Most of our villagers live with their animals, often under the same roof. Both live together, both starve together. Often enough the owner starves the poor cattle, exploits them, ill-treats them, unmercifully extracts work out of them. But if we reform our ways, we can both be saved. Otherwise we sink together, and it is just as well that we swim or sink together.

"The question today is to solve the problem of our starvation and poverty, but I have confined myself to the problem of the starvation and poverty of our cattle. Our rishis showed us the sovereign remedy. 'Protect the cow,' they said, 'and you protect all.' We have to add to the talents they have left us, and not to waste them. We have invited the experts, and we shall make every use of their advice. Nothing that we laymen say is final, we shall get the experts to test it with their knowledge and experience. We shall, therefore, always seek their advice and invite their criticism."

Cow-worship of the Ancients

Parts of the speech of Shri Vinoba, who presided, might have appropriately preceded Gandhiji's speech, for whereas Gandhiji showed what a pathetic travesty we had made of the ancient ideal of cow-worship, Vinoba showed from his knowledge of the ancient Sanskrit lore what a wonderful ideal it was. The ancient word was, he said, cow-protection (e. g. in the Gita), but *go-seva* (service of the cow) was deliberately chosen instead, in that protection was too big a bite and we had not the strength to give the cow complete protection. He also showed that the service

meant service based on use as also use based on service, but neither divorced from the other. The Vedas had described the cow as yielding a thousand jets of milk (which incidentally showed that there were in those days cows giving 50-60 lb. of milk, taking a jet as equal to an ounce of milk), and also as the giver of lustre to a lustreless body, and therefore worthy of the most devoted service. And the ideal of service had not been depicted better than by that unique representative of Hindu civilisation, Kalidas, in *Raghuvamsha* :

स्थितः स्थितामुच्चलितः प्रयातां
निषेदुषीमासनबंधधीरः ।
जलाभिलाषी जलमाददानां
छायेव तां भूपतिरन्वगच्छत् ॥

(Stopping as she stopped, and moving with her as she moved along,
Sitting down to guard her when she set her down the trees among,
Drinking water only after she had her fill of drink,
Even like her constant shadow followed her the faithful king.)*

Nowhere in the world's literature was to be found a nobler picture than that of the devoted king Dileepa serving the cow Nandini and following her as her shadow.

Speaking on the pledge, Shri Vinoba said: "The pledge in every sacred task was essential and helpful. The embarrassment it might cause to hosts was negligible when one thought of the service it would render to them. It was no good hiding one's light under a bushel, and we should go on scattering our fragrance as we go."

Citing the experience of a friend about the condition of cattle in famine, he said: "The first to die are male buffaloes, then comes the turn of cows, then that of buffaloes, and the last come the bullocks. Our partiality for the buffalo arises out of considerations of short-sighted economy, and though we know the value of bullocks and try to save them in preference to all other amimals, we forget that there would be no bullocks without the cows." "There were some," he added, "who thought that we must discard the bullock and go in for tractors. What is then to be done with the bullocks? They complacently assert that they can be used for food by those who have no scruples against it. They forget that the plan will ruin our agricultural economy — tractors are no good for small holdings — and destroy the cow and her progeny. In the Argentine Republic 10,000 bullocks are slaughtered for meat every day. The war has made this thing impossible there as in Europe, and so medical men are now waxing eloquent on the superior virtues of milk over beef. The fact is there was meat-eating and even beef-eating in India at some period of our history, and it gave place to the exclusive use of milk, when the people saw the ruinous nature of the former from the point of view of national economy."

* A very free rendering by me. M. D.

The Buffalo v. the Cow

The resolutions passed reflect the result of the maximum of unanimity that was possible on some of the most controversial topics. Were the *goshalas* and *pinjrapols* to be asked to give exclusive preference to the cows? What was to be done with the buffalo? If she were to be completely 'boycotted', there would be so much dearth of milk and ghee, and a premium would be put upon vegetable ghee, and so on. Sardar Datarsingh had no doubt that a good cow was in the long run a better economic proposition than a good buffalo. His views, which he expressed at length, may be put down in his own words. They were sent to us five years ago, and they have not altered since:

"The buffalo is not an economical animal for the following reasons:

1. A buffalo matures on the average one year later than a good Indian milch bred cow.

2. The dry period, i. e. the time when she goes dry and up to the time she calves, is more than thrice that of a cow.

3. A good cow will give more milk than a buffalo.

4. The male calves of the buffaloes are practically quite useless for agricultural purposes, and if sold fetch very little price, and therefore they are generally slaughtered, while the male calves of a cow are used all over India for agricultural purposes and are equally useful as female calves and fetch good price.

5. A buffalo is more susceptible to diseases than a cow.

6. A buffalo requires more looking after and is only happy when there is a large grazing area with plenty of water which is not in the reach of a small zamindar.

7. A buffalo feels the heat and cold much more, which results in the deterioration of the milk yield; but it is not the case with a cow.

8. The only point in favour of keeping a buffalo is that she gives a much higher percentage of fat than a cow, but if all the details of the production are taken into account, a good cow beats a buffalo even in that respect."

Years ago in the columns of *Young India* a very interesting controversy took place between Pandit Satavalekar and the late Shri C. V. Vaidya about cow-sacrifice and beef-eating in ancient India. The former, I think, successfully demonstrated that, though the practice was not absent, it was never universal and the Vedic precept was to hold the cow as sacred — अघ्न्या 'not to be killed'. (Rig Veda, viii, 101, 15-16) The discussion had no bearing on the present age beyond showing that beef-eating which was at one time prevalent was wisely given up by those who knew the principles of social economy, and that it is no use running at the throat of beef-eaters, who should be patiently persuaded that cow-slaughter is not in the interest of the nation. Kakasaheb Kalelkar, who was invited to speak on the resolution about *pinjrapols*, said that it was the cow herself who had taught us non-violence. "The story of Rantideva's sacrifice in the Mahabharata shows that the sacrifice of bovine animals and beef-eating were prevalent at a certain period in our history. But it was only when the cow began to yield sufficient milk and her progeny

began to be used for agriculture which gave us enough food and clothes that we ceased to look upon beef as an article of food. Enough clothes means proportionately less food — as I have seen with my own eyes in the case of sadhus — and the bullock as an agricultural animal has gone a great way in taking us near to ahimsa. And if we want to work towards a non-violent state, there is no alternative but to lay exclusive emphasis on protecting the cow and her progeny."

There seemed to be substantial agreement on these propositions, but no one seemed to be clear as regards the attitude to be adopted regarding the buffalo, and no one seemed to see how, if we saved the cow, the buffalo would also be saved. Did Gandhiji mean to say that even as khadi saved the Indian mill cloth, the protection of the cow would mean the protection of the buffalo?

"Yes," said Gandhiji, "but I mean something more. I have often said that I should not shed a single tear, if all the mills were to be destroyed. I would never say this regarding the buffalo."

"No," he said, explaining the matter at greater length. "My point is that, unless we protect the cow today, we will fail to save both the cow and the buffalo. And it is not possible to make a combined endeavour to save both. The combined endeavour will result in the buffalo devouring the cow. The cow is the more neglected animal, and that is why we should concentrate on the cow. But not even if Jamnalalji got a few crores of rupees can we achieve our object until we have converted the people to our view — especially the people who run *goshalas* and *pinjrapols*.

"There is no question of 'boycott', much less of the killing of buffaloes. Slaughter is a thing that suggests itself easily to Western economists. That is why they cut the Gordian knot by slaughtering the inferior breed of cows and bulls. But that solution is no good for me. It is my firm conviction that, if we master the real science of saving the cow, the science of saving the buffalo and other animals would automatically be revealed to us."

"But, supposing you were to boycott all the buffaloes in Sevagram, what would happen to them and their owners?" was a question put to Gandhiji.

"I promise to take charge of the buffalo in case you succeed in your mission of the cow to that extent. If the mill-owners voluntarily close down the mills, I shall dance with joy, but not if the owners of the buffaloes were to slaughter them. Western economics is divorced from ethics; our ethics and economics coincide or should, if they do not. My exclusive emphasis on the protection of the cow is due to the undue neglect of the cow although she in my opinion is a sound economic proposition. I do not need the aid of the Vedas to show me this, and this is a matter in which I would test the Vedic precept on the anvil of reason. Reason convinces me that, if I save the cow, I save the cow and the buffalo both. If anyone can convince me that the cow is dead beyond redemption, and that the buffalo alone needs to be protected, I am quite prepared to organise a 'Buffalo Protection Association'. But the reverse is the case. The buffalo needs no special protection, the cow needs it. The buffalo and the goat are as much my mothers as the cow. But I know that the poor goat cannot be saved, that the cow badly needs to be saved, and when we have saved the cow the buffalo will be automatically saved."

Grazing, Tannery, etc.

Various other questions were discussed — the most important one being that of grazing areas. There were several points on which even experts could not give definite guidance. Are grazing areas essential or would stall-feeding be enough for the cows? How far is the complaint just that the gradual disappearance of grazing areas has spelt the extinction of the cow and her progeny? If it is just, there should be an organised agitation for it. Sardar Datarsingh was of opinion that the essential was enough fodder and enough exercising area, and that more emphasis was necessary on fodder crops than on pasture land. Dr. Shahi, who had travelled a lot abroad, said that everywhere in Europe there were grazing areas attached to dairy farms. Shri Shrikant Mishra said that, if we depended entirely on grass land and gave the animal only grass, one head of cattle would require four acres of grass land. But if the land were to be put under fodder crops, an acre would be quite enough for one animal, and in canal areas an acre could maintain three heads of cattle, as three crops would be available. The need was for more production of fodder crops, as availability of grazing areas was very limited.

The whole question was beset with difficulties, and the Go-Seva Sangh will have to do plenty of research work before it can give proper guidance on the subject. Gandhiji tentatively suggested that co-operative owning of cows and co-operative owning of pasture for them would go a great length in improving both the breed and the milk yield and in helping to solve the question of grazing.

Regarding tannery a simple handbook on the essentials of skinning dead cattle, treating the hide, and disposal of the fleshing and the bones, is contemplated, and the experts have been told off to produce it without delay and make it available in all provincial languages.

The Programme

For the next year the Go-Seva Sangh should, suggested Gandhiji, concentrate on making cow's milk available throughout Wardha and its neighbourhood, on sending experts to *pinjrapols* in order to collect material, throw out suggestions, and help in making them approximate to the ideal *pinjrapol* contemplated by the Sangh, and on having a laboratory in Wardha for the testing of milk and ghee, and so on. The Sangh will also try to enlist at least a thousand members.

What Shri Vinoba said at the conclusion of the proceedings was worth pondering by every member of the Sangh. "We have had so many Sanghs," he said, "and we have a fresh one now. The A. I. S. A., though it had enlisted hundreds of sacrificing workers, may be said to have only begun the great

task that it has to achieve. Then came the Harijan Sevak Sangh. It took me to Nalwadi, where we now have a tannery and a *parishramalaya*. Then came the Village Industries Association which has set before itself a work as difficult as putting a thousand loose ends together, and in face of bazars teeming with foreign articles it looked almost a forlorn task to popularise village-made articles. Then came 'Nai Talim'—Basic Education—with regard to which we have made as yet little headway, and I have often been wondering whether I should not take up a school myself and work at it. Now this work has come upon us. It is far more difficult than those I have mentioned, and I feel nearly baffled. The whole day I have been thinking what exactly I have done for cow-protection today. For khadi I have done at least some work in that I was all the while plying my takli before you; but what did I do for cow-protection? The work needs all the skill and the resourcefulness and the purity that we can muster. I devoted twelve years to mastering the art and science of khadi, spinning eight hours a day for a long period of time. That has given me an insight which reveals me something new every day. We have, therefore, to apply ourselves to this new task with the devotion of King Dileepa and do something concrete every day for the cow as he did."

Sevagram, 7-2-42 **M. D.**

BRITISH AND AMERICAN NAZISM

If Dr. George Washington Carver had been born a white man, his name would have been as famous in the world of science as that of Burbank, Edison, or the Curies. But he was born a Negro, and so—in spite of his epoch-making discoveries in the field of science—synthetising the products of pea-nuts and potatoes and making of floor marbles and building boards from waste materials, and showing the immense potentialities of his native soil—he remains in America the shunned Negro that he was nearly 80 years ago. He was born in 1864. And yet a British explorer of the reputation of Sir Harry Johnston wrote about him: "Prof. Carver, who teaches scientific agriculture, botany, agricultural chemistry, etc. at Tuskegee, is an absolute Negro; but in the soundness of his science, he might be professor of Botany, not at Tuskegee, but at Oxford or Cambridge. Any European botanist of distinction, after ten minutes' conversation with this man, would instinctively treat him as a man on a level with himself." Dr. Carver occasionally sends his pamphlets and messages to Gandhiji, and the latest to bring these was Dr. John who was on a visit to America and incidentally visited Tuskegee. " will not accept the messages," said Gandhiji laughing, "unless Dr. Carver comes and delivers them himself." Dr. John said Dr. Carver was too old now to come to India. But he works nevertheless in his garden, getting up every day at 4 o'clock, and remembers Gandhiji whenever he has an Indian visitor. He is so humble and simple in his habits that for weeks Dr. John mistook him for a gardener. Dr. Carver has now prepared potato powder which can keep for twenty years. The very first question that Gandhiji asked Dr. John about Dr. Carver was: "But even this genius suffers under the handicap of segregation, does not he?"

"Oh yes," said Dr. John, "as much as any Negro."

"And yet these people talk of democracy and equality! It is an utter lie," said Gandhiji in indignation.

"But," said Dr. John, "Dr. Carver is never bitter or resentful."

"I know," said Gandhiji, "that is what we believers in non-violence have to learn from him. But what about the claim of these people who are said to be fighting for democracy?"

Well he is "an absolute Negro", and when "equality" and "democracy" are mentioned the words "of the white races" are understood. That is what may be called American Nazism. *The New Statesman* of November 22, just to hand, describes what it terms a species of "British Nazism". The Southern Rhodesia Land Apportionment Act of 1941, which came into force in August 1941, divides the country into 49 million acres reserved for white ownership, 29 million acres for native ownership, and the rest as forest area and unassigned; it makes it obligatory on the natives now living in the "white" areas to leave by the end of 1942, unless they are labourers for Europeans. These 49 million acres are reserved for 55,000 Europeans, and the 29 million for 1,100,000 Africans. "The British Government has thus agreed to condemn a million British subjects to restriction to a third of their own country and service-villainage in the rest of it for the benefit of a minority of 55,000 British subjects. And Parliament has had no opportunity to prevent this application of a purely Nazi policy, and one, moreover, in flat contradiction of repeated Governmental statements of colonial principle, within the British Empire."

The League of Coloured Peoples addressed a memorial to the Colonial Secretary, which stated among other things: That the half of the area reserved for the European population (less than one-twentieth of the whole) includes most of the best and easily accessible lands of the country; the "Native areas" are overcrowded, inadequately watered, and infested with tsetse fly; that the policy is not even an honest policy of segregation but of compelling the blacks to toil for the whites and to own no land; that this is Hitler's plan for the conquered countries in Europe; that it is wrong to suggest that the policy is favoured by the natives; that white agriculture is a failure in Southern Rhodesia, propped up by subsidies; and that Lord Cranborne, the Colonial Secretary, should display the "backbone to stand up to the small gang of white settlers who dominate the territory." He has not the backbone. For this letter has elicited a reply signed by a Colonial Office official saying that "no useful purpose would be served by discussing the principles involved."

Sevagram, 8-2-42 **M. D.**

THE ASHRAM PRAYER

(By M. K. Gandhi)

The Ashram prayer has become very popular. Its development has been spontaneous. The *Ashram Bhajanavali* (Hymn Book) has gone into several editions and is increasingly in demand. The birth and growth of this prayer has not been artificial. There is a history attached to almost every shloka and every selected bhajan. The *Bhajanavali* contains among others bhajans from Muslim Sufis and Fakirs, from Guru Nanak, and from the Christian Hymnary. Every religion seems to have found a natural setting in the prayer book.

Chinese, Burmese, Jews, Ceylonese, Muslims, Parsis, Europeans and Americans have all lived in the Ashram from time to time. In the same way two Japanese sadhus came to me in Maganwadi in 1935. One of them was with me till the other day when war broke out with Japan. He was an ideal inmate of our home in Sevagram. He took part in every activity with zest. I never heard of his quarrelling with anyone. He was a silent worker. He learnt as much Hindi as he could. He was a strict observer of his vows. Every morning and evening he could be seen going round with his drum and heard chanting his *mantra*. The evening worship always commenced wtih his *mantra* नम्यो हा रेंगे क्यों, which means "I bow to the Buddha, the giver of true religion." I shall never forget the quickness, the orderliness, and utter detachment with which he prepared himself the day the police came without notice to take him away from the Ashram. He took leave of me after reciting his favourite *mantra* and left his drum with me. "You are leaving us, but your *mantra* will remain an integral part of our Ashram prayer," were the words that came spontaneously to my lips. Since then, in spite of his absence, our morning and evening worship has commenced with the *mantra*. For me it is a constant reminder of Sadhu Keshav's purity and single-eyed devotion. Indeed its efficacy lies in that sacred memory.

While Sadhu Keshav was still with us Bibi Raihana Tyabji also came to stay at Sevagram for a few days. I knew her to be a devout Muslim but was not aware, before the death of her illustrious father, of how well-versed she was in Koran Sharif. When that jewel of Gujarat, Tyabji Saheb, expired no sound of weeping broke the awful silence in his room. The latter echoed with Bibi Raihana's sonorous recitation of verses from the Koran. Such as Abbas Tyabji Saheb cannot die. He is ever alive in the example of national service which he has left behind. Bibi Raihana is an accomplished singer with an ample repertory of bhajans of all kinds. She used to sing daily as well as recite beautiful verses from the Koran. I asked her to teach some verses to any of the inmates who could learn them, and she gladly did so. Like so many who come here she had become one of us. Raihana went away when her visit was over, but she has left a fragrant reminder of herself. The well-known 'al Fateha' has been included in the Ashram worship. The following is a translation of it:

"1. I take refuge in Allah from Satan the accursed.
2. Say: He is God, the one and only
God, the Eternal, Absolute,
He begetteth not nor is He begotten,
And there is none like unto Him.

3. Praise be to God,
The Cherisher and Sustainer of the worlds,
Most Gracious, most Merciful,
Master of the Day of Judgment,
Thee do we worship
And Thine aid we seek.

Show us the straight way,
The way of those on whom
Thou hast bestowed Thy Grace,
Those whose (portion) is not wrath
And who go not astray."

I am writing this note in reply to an ardent Hindu friend who has thus gently reproached me: "You have now given the *Kalma* a place in the Ashram. What further remains to be done to kill your Hinduism?"

I am confident that my Hinduism and that of the other Ashram Hindus has grown thereby. There should be in us an equal reverence for all religions. Badshah Khan, whenever he comes, joins in the worship here with delight. He loves the tune to which the Ramayana is sung, and he listens intently to the Gita. His faith in Islam has not lessened thereby. Then why may I not listen to the Koran with equal reverence and adoration in my heart?

Vinoba and Pyarelal studied Arabic and learnt the Koran in jail. Their Hinduism has been enriched by this study. I believe that Hindu-Muslim unity will come only through such spontaneous mingling of hearts and no other. Rama is not known by only a thousand names. His names are innumerable, and He is the same whether we call him Allah, Khuda, Rahim, Razzak, the Breadgiver, or any name that comes from the heart of a true devotee.

Sevagram, 2-2-42

(From *Harijansevak*)

CONTENTS

Question Box	M. K. Gandhi	38
Adivasis	M. K. Gandhi	38
Individual or Collective? ...	M. K. Gandhi	39
"Suppose Germany Wins"	M. K. Gandhi	40
Go-Seva Sangh — II ...	M. D.	40
British and American Nazism	M. D.	43
The Ashram Prayer ...	M. K. Gandhi	44
Notes:		
Seth Jamnalal Bajaj ...	M. K. G.	37
Misbehaviour of Troops	M. K. G.	37
Hyderabad State ...	M K. G.	37

Printed and Published by Jivanji Dahyabhai Desai, Navajivan Press, Kalupur, Ahmedabad
Subscription Rates — INLAND: One year, Rs. 5; six months, Rs. 3. FOREIGN: One year, Rs. 7 or 12 sh. or $. 3